

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PRIORITIES AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONGUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS
TO SET UP SMALL UNITS SUCH AS COLLEGESA. Introduction:

At the meeting of March 4, 1977, Senate approved a resolution to recommend to the Board of Governors, amongst other items, "the establishment of small units such as Colleges".

Article 2 of the mandate of the Senate Committee on Priorities and Resource Allocation requires that it "report to Senate on the long-range implications of proposals submitted to Senate for new academic programmes, or major restructuring of existing programmes, at all levels, and advise it on their relationship to the University priorities and implications for resource use." Furthermore, in order to discharge its mandate as effectively as possible, the Priorities Committee has been studying the rôle of Concordia in the Quebec university system. This Committee therefore believes that it can perform a useful service in drawing the attention of Senate to various aspects of upcoming proposals for the establishment of the "small units such as Colleges". The Priorities Committee has not studied specific proposals, nor does it consider that it is its responsibility to do so. It hopes that the guidelines which follow will be useful to Senate, and also to the "Committee on Colleges", in assessing the desirability of implementing proposals as they are brought forward, and the implications of such implementation.

The Priorities Committee reminds Senate that it did not take a final decision on nomenclature, and this important matter should not be allowed to drift. A generic term is needed for the "small units", which takes account of the way in which "college" is used elsewhere, particularly in the Province of Quebec. Since this generic term has not yet been determined, the word "unit" is used in this document.

The Priorities Committee points out to Senate that proposals are coming forward at a time when enrollments in the Faculty of Arts and Science are expected to drop. The Committee consequently views proposed units as a device which, amongst other things, will contribute to the stabilization of enrollments in the Faculty, and assessments of proposals should be seen in this context.

The Priorities Committee draws the attention of members of Senate to the fact that the debate carried out by that body did not specify the procedures whereby the curricular aspects of the proposed units should be dealt with in relation to the curricular offerings of the various departments in the Faculty (see pp. 5-6 of the Minutes of the April 15, 1977 meeting of Senate, of which copies are attached).

B. Questions on individual proposals:

1. What are the precise objectives of the specific unit being proposed? What is its philosophy of education? (See p. 7 of the attached Senate Minutes.)
2. In the context of the enrollment considerations raised in section A, how will the proposed unit have a positive impact on enrollment?
3. When the proposal for the reorganization of Arts and Science was approved by Senate, it was suggested that some 10 or 12 small units could be envisaged. Consequently, great care must surely be taken in decisions to approve the first set of proposals, for fear of excluding subsequent proposals which might conceivably be of higher quality or greater potential. Since the number of proposals for small units which can be implemented is thus limited, does the proposed unit have sufficient quality and potential in its own right to warrant its implementation at this time?
4. The University's submission to the Council of Universities prior to the publication by that body of Perspective 1976 (Cahier IV), included the following statements:

"Concordia University is quite distinct in the nature of its enrollment, and in its particular functions and strengths. Most significantly, both component parts, Sir George Williams University and Loyola College, have long histories of active concern for the part-time student."

"It is incumbent on Concordia to preserve the quality of undergraduate education on both campuses; that must be the foundation of our services to our community and the province. This in turn requires continual concern for innovation in both structures and pedagogy, with particular reference to traditional and to developing aspects of continuing education."

The first of these statements was quoted by the Conseil in Cahier IV.

How do the specific objectives of the proposed unit fit in with these particular objectives of the University, with special reference to part-time students?

5. The Council of Universities, in Perspective 1976 (Cahier IV), proposed the following "mission" for Concordia:

"Il ressort de ces caractéristiques que l'Université Concordia s'est donnée comme mission fondamentale de desservir les besoins de la communauté anglophone de Montréal en services éducatifs d'enseignement supérieur à temps partiel, et cela à tous les cycles de formation universitaire."

Le Conseil des universités entérine cette mission de l'Université Concordia dans le réseau des établissements d'enseignement supérieur québécois. La reconnaissance de cette mission n'implique pas que cette université doive s'interdire d'offrir ses enseignements à une clientèle à temps complet. Ce type de clientèle garantit, en effet, une certaine stabilité à l'institution, peut permettre une administration plus économique et est essentiel pour que les programmes de 2e et 3e cycles constituent de véritables foyers de formation de chercheurs. Toutefois, la mission implique que cette université doive, par l'innovation, continuer à jouer son rôle de chef de file en éducation permanente et que tous les programmes qu'elle offre, qu'il s'agisse des 1er, 2e ou 3e cycles, s'adressent en priorité à cette partie de la communauté anglophone du Grand Montréal qui souhaite poursuivre des études à temps partiel. En répondant aux besoins de ce type de clientèle, l'Université Concordia a sa place spécifique dans le réseau et répond à une exigence de complémentarité avec l'Université McGill dont l'enseignement s'adresse en priorité aux étudiants qui poursuivent leurs études à temps complet.

Concordia a donc une place très nette dans le réseau des établissements d'enseignement supérieur québécois dans la mesure où ses principales activités sont conformes à sa mission: ouverture aux étudiants à temps partiel, importance relative du premier cycle, activités des 2e et 3e cycles en complémentarité avec McGill, innovation pédagogique."

Even if the above statement could be seen as ambiguous, in so far as "complémentarité" in the third paragraph is related specifically to graduate work, we have sufficient experience of the concept in other areas to know that it is not intended to be limited to that level.

The principle of complementarity rather than duplication means then that any major new curricular departure must be seen in the context of the whole Quebec university system. What would be the situation of the proposed unit in the system?

6. As has been noted in section A, the debate on the re-structuring of Arts and Science resulted in no specific legislative statements on the relationship between proposed units and academic departments in the matter of curricula at the level of course content and course distribution. The Minutes of the April 15 meeting of Senate indicate (p. 12) that the recorded discussion was to be transmitted to the "Committee on Colleges" in addition to the specific motions or directives. On pages 5-7 of the Minutes is to be found an extensive debate on the subject of the relationship between units and academic departments, with some concrete examples.

Where the proposed unit has a curricular dimension - and the thrust of the restructuring proposal is that it normally will so have - what will be the effect of its programme(s) on existing academic activities?

7. Further to #6, and with particular reference to p. 7 of the April 15 Senate Minutes, have the sponsors of the proposal approached those departments which will be required to provide the courses and/or learning activities, and are those departments in a position to provide them? If the proposed unit wishes to see the initiation of new courses or learning activities related to its own programmes, how will it obtain these services from academic departments? What are to be the arrangements for special seminars related to the philosophy of education of the proposed unit?
8. Faculty members appointed as fellows in the proposed undergraduate unit will have a responsibility towards their work in the unit, while remaining members of their respective academic departments. What proportion of the various fellows' activity will be channeled into operating the proposed unit? Has an assessment been made of the benefits of the time to be spent by fellows in the unit in terms of potential loss to the department? Has an assessment been made of the extent to which the unit is likely to become a focus for scholarly activity or tend to divert scholars from research and teaching activities at the graduate levels?
9. The University already has an unsatisfactory student/faculty ratio, and, in spite of sometimes vocal claims to the contrary, a below-average number of administrators in relation to the size of the student body. The proposed unit must surely be expected to provide a better situation qualitatively, but if there is also to be quantitative improvement, will this be at the expense of other academic and support areas in the University? Where will administrative support, both academic and other, come from?
10. Proposals are likely to request space, if only to house a minimum number of administrative and support personnel, and to provide whatever facilities may be necessary for the unit to carry out its social, as well as its purely academic, rôle. There may also be cases where specialized space and/or equipment are requested. What is the total amount, and the nature, of the space and/or facilities being asked for? Has an assessment been made of the effect on existing operations of the assignment of such space?
11. It may be anticipated that in most cases required resources will be in the area of the operating budget, but there may be some capital expenditures, either of a "one-shot" or recurrent nature. Fundamentally, it must be asked

how far can the proposal be implemented through redistribution of existing funding within the Faculty, or will funds from elsewhere in the University be required? Is it part of this proposal to solicit funds from outside organizations?

- C. The questions in Part B will have to be asked of each individual proposal. It may be anticipated, however, that what will come forward will be a proposal to implement a certain "package" of units, particularly in the first year or two. The Priorities Committee recommends that in such cases, Senate should reserve final judgement on any individual proposal until it has studied all the proposals in the group. In addition to examining the merits of each individual proposal, Senate should then ask: How does the aggregate of total decisions to be taken fit into available resources? What is to be modified, reduced or cut out? Which and how many of the proposals should be recommended to the Board of Governors for implementation, and in what time span? What are the chances that the effort required for the implementation of the first group will in effect close off the possibility of implementing the next set of proposals coming forward in the following year?

The challenge which Senate must face is that the success of the venture may well depend on the extent to which its members make wise choices amongst the first set of proposals which come before it.

February 8, 1978.

Excerpt from Senate minutes of April 15, 1977

It was stated that insofar as the wording of item C, resolution 2 (DOC-US-77-4-D3) was concerned, one could see a "college" recommending to the Council that among the programmes that should be available to students in that "college" would be one in which there would be a major in Economics and a minor in Sociology along with certain rules as to how the programme would be put together. That recommendation would come from the "college". The real question was where would a recommendation to change the content of a minor in Sociology, a major in Geography, or an honours in Economics normally be expected to come from? From the department which offers the major in Geography, i.e. the Geography department or from a "college" which has that major as one of the units that its students may take?

It was explained that a recommendation to change the content of a particular programme would normally come from the department. However, this does not preclude the possibility that in a certain case a rather unique major might come jointly from a department and a "college".

It was pointed out that the document from the Steering Committee (DOC-US-77-4-D3) which outlines the characteristics of the "colleges" was written in conjunction with sections 1 b) and 1 c) of the Enabling Resolutions (DOC-US-77-3-D7) which picks up the distinction between the responsibilities of the departments and the responsibilities of the "colleges". Without the Enabling Resolutions (DOC-US-77-3-D7), we do not have a complete concept.

It was argued that if the description of the roles of the departments and the "colleges" as defined in the Enabling Resolutions (DOC-US-77-3-D7) was strictly adhered to, it would not be possible for a "college" to exist under this description and have any control or input into the delivery system.

It was argued that one is not going to change the delivery system in the sense that a professor is going to change his total talent as a teacher by adopting a type of delivery that is completely foreign to him. What we are talking about is a very minor influence towards, for example, more use of tapes, audio-visual equipment, and course scheduling. The changes in the delivery system that a "college" could exercise will depend on the imagination of that "college" and the ability to find in the department the type of talent which could operate with that.

It was stated that it was assumed that resolution 2 c), v) of the Enabling Resolutions (DOC-US-77-3-D7) was to be interpreted to mean the "course content and the programmes of the discipline components, etc. We need to make clear that the "colleges" make recommendations with regard to the non-discipline aspect of the undergraduate programmes, that is, that the discipline component of undergraduate programmes is the responsibility of the department. The concern being expressed was not over the content of a particular course

but rather that a "college" might attempt to change the nature of the major or honours programme to suit their philosophy of education which may not be the philosophy of the department in terms of the educational goals of a particular discipline.

It was pointed out that departmental control was protected with respect to honours programmes, which are the programmes leading mainly to direct entry into graduate schools or to some designation of competence in Psychology, for example. The same applies to a major in Psychology. The clustering of psychology courses into something else other than that type of Psychology designation is not a threat to the good reputation of Psychology. It may nonetheless be a very useful clustering for some other purpose.

It was argued however, that while it is clear in the actual text of the Deans' Document that the department has control over honours and major programmes, the problem was that there was no enabling legislation that protects that.

Dr. O'Brien stated that these latter points were valid and that this was clearly an area which needs to be defined. While there may be fairly substantial agreement on what the division of authority is, it is a tricky area which, if not defined in words that are understood by all as signifying the same thing, will inevitably lead sooner or later to tensions between the "colleges" and the departments.

It was suggested that the problem might be solved by adding to resolution 2 c) (DOC-US-77-4-D3) the words "with due regard to the responsibilities of the departments as set out in item 2 c), in document US-77-3-D7".

Dr. O'Brien advised that what would have to be done was to define a statement which is not based on reference to other documents. This cannot be done by forty people sitting around a table. If the general direction of this discussion clarifies where we are going, something will have to be brought back in due course which will be the clear definitive legislation.

Responding to a question, Dr. O'Brien advised that it was his understanding from what has been said, that the content of the individual psychology courses, for example, is ultimately the responsibility of the department. Also, the list of courses in something that is going to be labeled an honours, major, or minor in Psychology, will ultimately be the responsibility of and under the authority of the Psychology department.

On the other hand, a "college", quite apart from all the negotiations that it undertakes, can and will have the right to select from the list of honours and majors programmes and say that a major in Psychology will be available to our students. But if they do not happen to like the content of the major in Psychology, for whatever reasons, they can select their own list of psychology courses and say that in order to get the

degree in this "college" a student must take these six psychology courses from the repertoire available. If the Psychology department does not happen to think that that gives a valid grouping in psychology, it perhaps cannot be called a major in Psychology. Rather, it might be called a major in Applied Social Science, or form a part thereof, or be a portion of the programme of "college X", or have whatever titles may be evolved for it. The point is, the "college" will have that degree of freedom in picking psychology courses or any other courses that they may wish to have.

It was pointed out that a "college" will respond to a certain philosophy of education by its choice of courses from the hundreds available in the University and the way in which it groups them. Nonetheless, the "colleges" and its Fellows, having decided on their philosophy of education and what kind of a psychology course may be an absolutely key thing in order to have it, will have a certain amount of missionary work which they will have to do towards the Psychology department to come to an agreement with that department.

It was argued that some form of pay off has to be worked into the system to induce departments to release faculty members interested in teaching in a "college".

Dr. O'Brien suspected that there was not going to be a satisfactory abstract answer to that problem. He emphasized that the moment of truth will come when a "college" makes its presentation to the vetting Committee and ultimately to Senate. In effect, before a "college" is actually approved it will have to declare itself, in specific enough terms, as to what its philosophy of education is. If its philosophy of education is going to involve an approach that will require a department or departments to make staffing available on a full time basis, it will have to be established at that point if that is realistic or not. If the departments concerned say that they like the idea and will have no problem doing it, there will be no difficulty. On the other hand, if what Senate faces at that point is an enthusiastic "college" that wants a certain approach, and a group of reluctant departments are saying no way, Senate will have to decide either not to have that "college" or that the departments are going to be leaned upon one way or another in order to develop an enthusiasm for that particular approach.

It was stated that the numbers "200 and 800" in resolution 2 d), (DOC-US-77-4-D3), were arbitrary numbers, although they could relate to the "10 and 20 Fellows" mentioned in resolution 2 a). It was argued that Senate should show a certain sense of budget responsibility by inserting a statement to the effect that the student/faculty ratio would be an important criteria in establishing "colleges."

It was suggested that when we move out of "Committee of the Whole" Senate might simply move to accept the general definition of the characteristics of "colleges" (DOC-US-77-4-D3) and refer it to the Committee that will be vetting proposals on "colleges" for their consideration and use. The Committee should also receive the minutes of the Senate meetings at which "colleges" have been discussed and it was essential that the Committee go through the record because there are many nuances that we are simply not going to attempt to fit into the document (US-77-4-D3).

It was felt also that some special attention has to be paid to departmental responsibility.

Dr. O'Brien agreed that that was an important point and while in a sense we have covered that by adding that the record of these meetings is to be referred also to the Committee, nonetheless it was appropriate to record that again because one of the clearer points that arose during the discussion was that there will have to be an appropriate and tightly written definition of the authority of departments and "colleges" in the curriculum area.

It was argued that the discussion should not be terminated without mention being made about something concerning the protection of the Fellows of a "college". What was in mind was a statement to the effect that the contractual committees for the Fellows of a "college" have appropriate direct representation from the "college". It was argued that to create a "college" and Fellows of a "college" and retain the present system where the contractual committee is made up solely of members of a department was not adequate.

Dr. O'Brien felt that that point could certainly be inserted into the minutes and in that sense become part of the record. It was an important point because what was being set up was something rather different than the existing structures and whatever the pros or cons of those structures may be, one could not assume that those procedures would work appropriately simply by transferring them.

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN BREEN, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT SENATE MOVE OUT OF "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

- MOTION CARRIED -

Regular Session

77-7-5

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MOORE, SECONDED BY DEAN CAMPBELL, THAT THE GENERAL DEFINITION OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF "COLLEGES" (RESOLUTION 2, DOCUMENT US-77-4-D3), BE ACCEPTED BY SENATE AND REFERRED TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON "COLLEGES" FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION AND USE, ALONG WITH THE MINUTES OF THIS MEETING AND EARLIER SENATE MEETINGS AT WHICH "COLLEGES" HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED.

- MOTION CARRIED -